

### REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated February 12, 2007. Claims 1-7, 14-16, and 19-22 are presented for examination, with Claims 1, 5, 14-16, 19 and 21 being in independent form. Claims 1, 5, 14-16, 19 and 21 have been amended. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1-7, 14-16 and 19-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by archived Web pages of Yahoo! allegedly dated 08/16/2000 (*Yahoo!*). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Should issues remain following a careful consideration of the present amendment, the courtesy of a telephone interview with the Applicants' attorney to provide clarification concerning those issues and discuss possible claim language to address the issues is respectfully requested.

By virtue of the features recited in Claim 1, a user is enabled to select a method of authentication from a plurality of methods of authentication and register the selected method of authentication. The user is further enabled to select from a different method of authentication for access to the restricted service without accessing the restricted service. These features are described, for example, in the specification at paragraphs 0027-0031. The choices available to a user include a method requiring both a user identification and password, a smart card, PIN authentication method, and the like, or combination thereof. Advantageously, Claim 1 provides a method of security which provides a user with the opportunity to select a method of authentication without being limited to predefined security features.

As understood by the Applicants, *Yahoo!* discloses how to register for personalized services and set up a user ID and password. *Yahoo!*, page 1. Apparently, after a user of the *Yahoo!* system has registered, the user only can “use this same ID and password for all of Yahoo!’s services.” *Yahoo!*, page 1 (emphasis added). A user is able to check a box such that the user will not be required to sign in each time he or she returns to the Website. Thus, *Yahoo!* only provides a single method of authentication, that of requiring a user to enter an ID and password. Only the convenience of causing the browser to “remember” the user’s ID and Password is provided when the user selects the “Remember my ID & Password.” This convenience simply causes the browser to “remember” the user’s ID and password such that the user can remain logged in. A user can “sign out of the personalized services...by clicking the “Sign Out” link.” *Yahoo!*, page 3. Thus, *Yahoo!* teaches away from “enabling a user to select a method of authentication from a plurality of methods of authentication” and “registering the user-selected method of authentication,” as recited in Claim 1.

As understood by Applicants, *Yahoo!* further teaches what to do if a user has forgotten his or her password. *Yahoo!*, page 2. If the user provides an alternate email address or answers a challenge question correctly he or she will gain back access to the account. *Id.* In addition, multiple profiles can be used with Yahoo!’s different services under the same account. *Yahoo!*, page 4. At page 3 of the Office Action, these pages of *Yahoo!* are cited as disclosing enabling a user to select a different method of authentication for access to a restricted service without accessing the restricted service. Applicants respectfully disagree with this characterization of *Yahoo!*. Nothing has been found in *Yahoo!* that would teach or suggest “wherein the user is enabled to select a different method

of authentication for access to the restricted service without accessing the restricted service,” as recited in Claim 1. In stark contrast, these features of Yahoo! require a user to provide backup information in order for “a new password [to] be assigned to [the user].” *Yahoo!*, page 2. The user has no option. Moreover, the method of entering alternate information in lieu of a password is directly correlated to the same authentication method since a user still cannot enter the system without first receiving a new password and logging into the Yahoo! Website. This is not a “different method of authentication for access” but instead merely a single authentication method with a method of resetting a portion of the required information.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 1 is patentable over *Yahoo!*.

Independent Claims 5, 14-16, 19, and 21 recite features similar to those discussed above with respect to Claim 1 and therefore are also believed to be patentable over *Yahoo!* for the reasons discussed above.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jonathan Berschadsky/  
Jonathan Berschadsky  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 46,551

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY\_Main 622270\_1